

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE
UTILITY PATENT APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL UNDER 37 CFR §1.53(b)

To: Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Box Patent Application
Washington, D.C. 20231, USA

Docket No.: 08-887817US

Inventor(s): GRUBER, John G.

The following are enclosed for filing this nonprovisional application relating to:
TIME SIMULATION TECHNIQUES TO DETERMINE NETWORK AVAILABILITY

☐ CONTINUING APPLICATION. This is a ☐ Continuation ☐ Divisional ☐ Continuation-in-part
of prior Application No. _____

☐ A Certified Copy of the application(s) from which this application claims priority under
35 U.S.C. §119 has been filed in the prior application identified above.

☐ Copy of the assignment(s) to , recorded with respect to the prior
application identified above.

☒ Specification, including Claims and Abstract

Pages: 15

☒ Drawings

Sheets: 7

☒ Oath or Declaration

Pages: 3

☒ New

or ☐ Copy from the prior application identified above (for cont /div., 37 CFR §1.63(d))

☐ Signed statement attached deleting inventor(s) named in the prior application

☐ The entire disclosure of the prior application is considered as being part of the disclosure
of the accompanying application and is hereby incorporated therein by reference.

☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document (if foreign priority is claimed)

☐ Assignment Papers (cover sheets(s) and documents(s)). Please record and return to the
undersigned.

☐ Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)/PTO-1449

☐ Copies of IDS Citations

☐ Preliminary Amendment. Fees are calculated below after entry of any preliminary amendment.

☐ Return Receipt Postcard

☐ Other: _____

FEES: Basic Fee: \$710.00

Assignment(s): _____ x \$40.00 =

☐ Multiple Dependent Claims

Total Claims: 11 - 20 = x \$18.00 =

Independent Claims: 2 - 3 = x \$80.00 =

TOTAL FEE: \$710.00

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the following fees, and to charge any additional
fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 07-1750.

☒ Fees required under 37 CFR §1.116 including the Total Fee calculated above.

☐ Fees required under 37 CFR §1.117 (Patent Application Processing Fees).

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Yours very truly

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
Suite 2600, 160 Elgin Street
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1P 1C3
Tel: (613) 233-1781
Fax: (613) 563-9869

By: 
John D. Harris
Registration No. 39,465

Date: November 13, 2000

TIME SIMULATION TECHNIQUES TO DETERMINE NETWORK AVAILABILITY

Field of Invention

5 The invention is in the area of communications network analysis. In particular, it is directed to simulation techniques for analyzing the availability or unavailability of end-to-end network connections or services.

Background of Invention

10 Capacity planning is an important function in designing and provisioning communication networks. While network link and node capacities have been estimated for years, there has been relatively little study of availability, especially for large mesh networks. Large mesh networks with multiple nodes and links, and with arbitrary topology, are not very amenable to an exact analysis, especially for
15 multiple failures. The multiple failure case means that by the time another failure occurs, repair processes for at least one previous failure have not completed, so that there may be more than one failure to deal with at any one time. Simple structured point-to-point or ring networks, for example, may have 1+1 or ring protection mechanisms for single failures, e.g., a single fiber cut at a time. The
20 single failure case means that by the time a second failure occurs, repair processes for the first failure have completed, so that there is no more than one failure to deal with at any one time. In typically route or geographically constrained networks of this kind, analytical and approximate techniques can give insight and understanding of service availability for each of any possible single failures. If,
25 however, the network is unstructured like a mesh, if the number of nodes is large, and if multiple failures are considered, the calculations, even if approximate, quickly become very complicated.

 An article entitled "Computational and Design Studies on the Unavailability of Mesh-restorable Networks" by Matthieu Cloqueuer and Wayne
30 D. Grover on Proceedings of DRCN '2000, April 2000, Munich describes computational techniques of unavailability of a mesh network for single and multiple (mainly two) failures

 As mentioned in the above article, network availability generally refers to the availability of specific paths (also called connections) and not that of a whole
35 network. Networks as a whole are never entirely up nor entirely down. "Network

availability" can be defined as the average availability of all connections in a network but this gives less insight and comparative value than working with individual paths, or perhaps a selection of characteristic reference paths. Therefore, service availability between source and sink nodes is more meaningful to communications users who pay for such services.

For a quantitative study of network availability, Figure 1 illustrates service on a specific path as down (unavailable) in durations $U_1, U_2, U_3, \dots, U_n$ along the time axis. On the vertical axis (U - unavailability), 'u' indicates the service as unavailable, and 'a' as available. Service availability over a period T is the fraction of this period during which the service is up. The availability and unavailability of the network (or service) therefore are defined as follows:

$$\text{Availability} = \lim \{(T - \sum U_i)/T\} = \text{MTTF}/(\text{MTTR} + \text{MTTF})$$

$$\text{Unavailability} = 1 - \text{Availability} = \text{MTTR}/(\text{MTTR} + \text{MTTF})$$

Where, MTTR is the mean time to recover or repair, and MTTF is the mean time to failure. Recovery is by relatively fast means of network protection (in tens of milliseconds) or restoration (perhaps within a second) capabilities, whereas repair is much longer (typically hours).

The above referenced article discusses computational approaches for analyzing availability under a two-failure scenario. Such approaches are quite complex.

There is need for faster and easier techniques to determine service availability, especially in large mesh networks. Simulation provides tractability for large networks, and is also a good check on the accuracy of simple, approximate or analytical methods. Thus, the time simulation technique is a relatively easier and faster process that complements more insightful analytical approaches to availability.

Summary of Invention

According to the basic concept, the present invention is a time simulation technique for determining the service availability (or unavailability) of end-to-end network connections (or paths) between source and sink nodes. In accordance with one aspect, the invention is directed to a simulation technique to determine either the network availability or unavailability.

In accordance with one aspect, the invention is directed to a time simulation method of determining service availability of a communications

network having a plurality of nodes and a plurality of links. The same principles can be applied to mesh networks or to other networks, such as ring networks. The method includes steps of: (a) selecting a link between two network nodes; (b) performing a simulated link failure on the selected link; (c) selecting a connection
5 between two network source and sink nodes; and (d) determining the unavailability and availability of the connection under the simulated link failure condition. The method further includes (e) of repeating (c) and (a) and (b); and (f) of summing the unavailability and availability of connections after each repetition until a predetermined number of connections have been selected, and until a
10 simulated link failure has been performed on all links; or until the summed unavailability and availability has been determined to converge, whichever is earlier. (A convergence process may be used, for example, if an operator deems there to be too many failure scenarios to consider exhaustively, or it is too time consuming to consider all failure scenarios exhaustively.) The predetermined
15 number of connections of step (f) may be all connections or a predccided subset of connections.

In accordance with a further aspect, the invention is directed to a time simulation apparatus for determining service availability of a mesh or other communications network. The apparatus includes a network having a plurality of
20 nodes and a plurality of links; the links having attributes relating to their failure, recovery and repair mechanisms. The apparatus further includes a mechanism for selecting one of the plurality of links based on the attributes; a failure/repair module for performing a simulated failure and repair on the selected link; a mechanism for selecting a connection between source and sink nodes; and an
25 arithmetic mechanism for calculating availability of the selected connection.

Other aspects and advantages of the invention, as well as the structure and operation of various embodiments of the invention, will become apparent to those ordinarily skilled in the art upon review of the following description of the invention in conjunction with the accompanying drawings.

30

Brief Description of Drawings

Embodiments of the invention will be described with reference to the accompanying drawings, wherein:

Figure 1 is a time-related graph in which periods of unavailable service are shown.

Figure 2 shows a meshed network with links and nodes, also showing a path or connection between source node A and sink node Z.

Figure 3 is a flow diagram of the simulation technique according to one embodiment of the invention.

Figure 4 shows a simple network for the purpose of illustrating the link selection aspect of the invention.

Figure 5 is a graph showing an example probability density of link selection.

Figure 6 is a graph showing an example cumulative probability of link selection generated from Figure 5.

Figure 7 shows example probability densities of TTF (time to failure).

Figure 8 is a uniform TTF probability density to illustrate details.

Figure 9 shows a simple network for the purpose of illustrating the TTF aspect of the invention, similar to Figure 4 except that it shows a fiber cut on link No. 4.

Figure 10 is a graph showing an exponential TTF probability density.

Figure 11 is a graph showing a cumulative probability distribution generated from Figure 10.

Figure 12 is a schematic block diagram of the simulation technique according to one embodiment.

Figure 13 is a hypothetical display of expected simulation results after one or very few link failures, according to an embodiment of the invention.

Figure 14 is a hypothetical display of expected results after most or all link failures, according to an embodiment of the invention.

Detailed Description of Preferred Embodiments of Invention

Referring to Figure 2, a network has a plurality of nodes and links. The present invention considers the service availability between specific source and sink nodes. The service availability (unavailability) of a connection depends on not only the availability of each link in the connection, but also that of all other links, because failure of any link may affect the availability of the connection under consideration -- that is, other failed links may prevent successful recovery (protection or restoration) of the connection.

In Figure 2, it is assumed that connections are already provisioned. The problem therefore can be stated as follows.

There are N nodes and L links in the network, each link having length d_i . There are C possible connections between source-sink node pairs of type A and Z, each connection using l_j links. The connection distance CD is the sum of d_i 's over l_j links per connection. The total network link distance TD is the sum of d_i 's over L network links.

The simulation goal is to determine how the link failure process affects the connection availability between nodes A and Z. As mentioned earlier, the availability is defined as:

$$\text{Connection unavailability} = U = \text{MTTR}/(\text{MTTF} + \text{MTTR}),$$

$$\text{Connection availability} = 1 - U = \text{MTTF}/(\text{MTTF} + \text{MTTR}),$$

Where, MTTF is an average failure rate of F fiber cuts/(1000km*year) and MTTR is either MTTRc (recovery time for effective protection/restoration) or MTTRp (repair time for no, or ineffective, protection/restoration). Recovery indicates protection or restoration, and restoration implies any reasonable routing algorithm, e.g., least cost, shortest path, etc., per operator preference.

Some examples are as follows:

- If $F = 2$ fiber cuts/(1000km*year) and distance $D = 5000\text{km}$, $\text{MTTF} = 1000/(2*5000) = 0.1$ years = 36.5 days.
- For the same link as above, if 50 ms is needed for effective protection;
 $U = [0.5/(3600*24)]/[36.5 + 0.5/(3600*24)] = < 0.000002\%$;
 $A = 1 - U \Rightarrow 99.999998\% \sim 8 \text{ nines.}$
- For the same link as above, if 500ms is needed for effective restoration; $U = [0.5/(3600*24)]/[36.5 + 0.5/(3600*24)] = < 0.000002\%$;
 $A = 1 - U \Rightarrow 99.999998\% \sim 7 \text{ nines.}$
- For the same link as above, if 8 hours is needed for repair under no or ineffective protection/restoration;
 $U = (8/24)/(36.5 + 8/24) = < 0.9\%$;
 $A = 1 - U \Rightarrow 99.1\% \sim 2 \text{ nines.}$

Figure 3 is a flow diagram of the algorithm according to one embodiment of the invention. It is assumed that only link failures (F fiber cuts/1000km per year) occur, since they tend to have a dominant effect on availability. Furthermore, only single link failures are considered in Figure 3 - multiple link failure are considered later. Node failures are not specifically considered here but

can be emulated by considering that all links emanating from a node fail simultaneously – a particular multiple failure scenario. Referring to Figure 3, the simulation algorithm for the network under discussion runs as follows:

- 5 (1) At 30, randomly select a network link l to fail ("distance weighted" as described later);
- (2) At 32, randomly fail selected network link l based on its TTF density distribution (distance dependent as described later);
- 10 (3) At 34, randomly select time to repair (TTRp) based on its TTRp density (as described later). (Note that one can also select times to recover (TTRc) based on TTRc densities. But these times tend to be quite small and less variable compared to repair times. So, here these times are fixed, e.g., at 50 ms for protection, or e.g., at 500 ms for restoration.)
- 15 (4) At 36, select a connection (connection selection can be, e.g., sequential, random, or be based on priority, as discussed later);
- (5) At 38, decide if the selected connection is affected or not by the link failure in (2) above;
- (6) At 40, if the connection is unaffected, accumulate 0 (unavailable time $U_t = 0$) for this failure on this connection, and proceed with cumulative calculation of connection U and A (unavailability and availability) at 42 (cumulating will begin for subsequent failures);
- 20 (7) At 44, if the connection is affected, invoke the failure recovery scheme at 46 to determine whether or not the failure recovery scheme is effective at 48;
- 25 At 50, if effective, accumulate unavailable time $U_t = U_{t\text{recover}}$ for this affected connection and calculate cumulative connection U and A at 40;
- At 52, if ineffective, accumulate unavailable time $U_t = U_{t\text{repair}}$ for this affected connection and calculate cumulative connection U and A at 40;
- (Note, the failure recovery scheme will be by means of separate processes for either protection or restoration, related to the capacity planning process for
- 30 allocating protection or restoration bandwidth, and for switching links or rerouting connections over this bandwidth to avoid failures.)
- (8) At 54, if not all the connections have been selected, go back to 36 to repeat for all connections (or for any subset, per operator preference), continue to calculate
- 35 U_t ($U_t = 0$, or $U_{t\text{recover}}$, or $U_{t\text{repair}}$, as applicable) for each connection and calculate cumulative connection U and A at 42;

(9) At 56, determined if all links (or sufficient links, or specified links, per operator preference) have been selected to fail at least once (or more often, per operator preference);

if yes, end at 58;

5 if no, determined if U and A converge (e.g., per operator preference - to save simulation time, or if U and A are changing so little, or are already adequate enough to not warrant further simulation);

(10) At 60, if convergence, end at 58;

10 if no, go back to 30 to select another link to fail and repeat the procedure to continue for all failure combinations or until convergence.

Link Selection

Per operator preference, there may be many ways to select a link to fail, e.g., sequentially, randomly, all, or selected subset, from experience, etc.

15 However, based on the characteristic of F fiber cuts/(1000km*year), a longer link is more likely to fail, so, as one example, the link distance (d_i) weighted probability is introduced here to select a link to fail. The selection probability = d_i/TD (the ratio of link distance d_i , to total network link distance TD). At 30 in Figure 3, links will be selected according to these probabilities. In this way, 20 longer links get selected with correspondingly higher probability. For example, if one link has twice the distance of another, the probability that that link is selected is twice that of the other.

25 Per operator preference, selection could be with replacement (since the same link can fail more than once), or without replacement (e.g., to speed simulation time and/or to have more links covered).

To illustrate selection of links to fail, Figure 4 shows a simple network with link parameters as follows:

Link No. i	Distance d_i km	Probability of selection = d_i/TD
1	$d_1=100$	0.1
2	$d_2=300$	0.3
3	$d_3=150$	0.15
4	$d_4=200$	0.2
5	$d_5=250$	0.25
Total	$TD=1000$	1

In the table above, link numbers and their distances are shown together with their distance-weighted probability of selection d_i/TD . Figure 5 is a graph showing the probability density of link selection vs link distance. Figure 6 shows the cumulative probability distribution of link selection derived from Figure 5. (In Figures 5 and 6, the X-axis happens to show link distance ordered from longest to shortest, but this ordering is not necessary.) A uniform random number generator drives the link selection mechanism, that is, the generator generates a random number between 0 and 1 shown on the Y axis and selects a corresponding link shown on the X axis. For example, a random number of 0.7 would select link No. 4, as shown.

Although this is one way of selecting links to fail, other criteria can be considered per operator preference. For example, link infrastructure type (aerial versus buried) or location (city versus country) may be more critical to fiber cuts than just link distance. In such cases, more or less weight is given to such links and corresponding alternatives to Figures 5 and 6 can be used.

TTF (time to fail) selection.

Like the link selection mechanism discussed above, a random number generator generates a random number, which selects a TTF from a TTF distribution with MTTF. Distributions are preferably based on operator experience, but can be any distribution per operator preference. Example TTF densities are uniform, normal, exponential, etc., as shown in Figure 7. Figure 8 shows a generalized uniform TTF density to explain some of the parameters in more detail. For fiber cuts, $MTTF = 1000/(F \cdot d_i)$, where F is the average number of fiber cuts per year and d_i is the link fiber length in km. The uniform density ranges from "min" to "max", where "min" ≥ 0 and "max" $= 2MTTF - \text{min} \leq 2MTTF$. The density on the Y-axis is determined by $1/(\text{max} - \text{min}) = 1/[2(MTTF - \text{min})] \geq 1/(2MTTF)$.

Another critical aspect of the TTF density is if times to failure can be smaller than times to repair (TTRp). For $TTF > TTRp$, only single failure cases will occur (as addressed at present), but if $TTF < TTRp$, multiple failures can occur and have a relatively higher impact on availability (single and multiple failure cases were explained earlier). The granularity of TTF samples is preferably less than $1/10^{\text{th}}$ of minimum repair time, for reasonably accurate

availability assessment during multiple failures (repair time selection is discussed later).

Analogous to link selection discussed earlier, TTF densities are used for TTF selection as follows. Figure 9 is the same network as in Figure 4 except that it shows a failure in link No. 4. Links are assumed to have an exponential TTF density as shown in Figure 10. This density would approximately apply, for example, if an operator found that failures tended to bunch together in time. TTF is selected as follows. Figure 11 is the TTF cumulative probability distribution, corresponding to Figure 10. In Figures 10 and 11, MTTF of link No. 4 is shown for reference. Link No. 4 has a distance of $d_4 = 200$ km and has an average of $F = 2$ fiber cuts per year. From $MTTF = 1000/(F \cdot d_i)$, this translates to $MTTF = 2.5$ years which corresponds to exponential probability of 0.63.

Like the selection mechanism for links, a uniform random number generator drives TTF selection. For example, in Figure 11, a random number of 0.5 selects TTF = 1.7 years for link No. 4.

As with link selection above, there may be different TTF distributions for different links under different conditions. The distribution for each link could be based on experience in terms of infrastructure type (aerial, buried), type of right-of-way (beside railroad, in pipeline), location (city, country), proneness to construction activity or disasters (accidents, floods, earth quakes), etc.

Once the TTF value is determined, a TTF counter is set to the TTF value and is decremented every clock increment. The selected link is considered to fail when the counter reaches 0.

TTRp (time to repair) selection

Like the TTF selection mechanism above, a random number selects a value from a TTRp distribution with MTTRp. When a link failure occurs, a link TTRp counter is started with the selected TTRp value and then is decremented every clock increment until the counter reaches 0 at which time the link is considered repaired and is returned to the network for service. Note that in multiple failure cases, there may be more than one such counter running at any one time.

As with link and TTF selections above, in generating the TTRp distribution, or distributions, per operator preference it is possible to account for

numerous effects, e.g., demographics, infrastructure, age of equipment, seasonal and time-to-day effects, work force, etc.

As noted earlier, fixed times to recover (TTRc) are used (since recovery times are very small compared to repair times).

5 It should be noted that Figure 3 excludes details of clock increments and of setting, decrementing and tracking TTF and TTRp counters, etc. *TBD*

Connection selection

10 Here, for simplicity, all connections are randomly selected without replacement. This can be done using a uniform density and corresponding linear distribution of connections, together with a random number generator for selection, entirely similar to the other selection processes already discussed above.

15 However, how connections are selected may effect availability results. For instance, under multiple failure conditions, connections selected earlier have a better chance of recovering and of having higher availability than those selected later.

20 Thus, connections can be selected according to various criteria, per operator preference, that is: sequentially, randomly, with/without priority, (e.g., mission critical vs best effort traffic), all, or specific subset (e.g., reference connections), etc.

Figure 12 is a block diagram of the simulation apparatus 100 according to one embodiment of the invention.

25 Referring to Figure 12, a database 105 holds network data on the network, and on individual nodes, links and connections. As shown, the data identifies resources, and includes distances, selection criteria, failure, recovery and repair data, etc. A generator 110 generates random numbers by which a selector 120 selects links (and/or nodes) and their failures, and by which selected connections are affected or not, according to the stored data concerning link, node and
30 connection attributes. The link attributes includes the distance, TTF, TTRc, TTRp, etc. Once a link and a connection are selected, a simulation mechanism 115 performs simulated failure and restoration processes under the control of clock increments. The clock 125 generates clock increments, which are calibrated to
35 correspond to a specific real time interval - for instance, one clock increment

might be $1/1000^{\text{th}}$ of real time. An arithmetic module 130 calculates the availability or unavailability of the selected connection and thereafter the service availability of the network. Finally, the availability is displayed on a display module 135.

5 Figures 13 and 14 are hypothetical histograms of expected connection availability performance after the first few failures and after many failures, respectively. These results could be displayed on a display module. Over the simulation time, Figure 13 migrates to Figure 14, showing how each connection's availability is affected as more failures are encountered. Figure 14 is an example
10 of what may be a useful way for simulation results to be summarized and presented to an operator. For example, the average availability is an indication of the overall network availability, and it would also be evident how many and which connections provide high availability (e.g., at least 99.999%), etc. However, specific connections and their availability are also identifiable on the X-axis, for
15 example, connections known by the operator to carry critical services. Further, it could be made possible for the operator to select any such connection and get a log of its simulation details, e.g., as to the route it took, its distance, number of hops it went through, which failures affected it, if recovery was successful, etc. While the invention has been described according to what are presently
20 considered to be the most practical and preferred embodiments, it must be understood that the invention is not limited to the disclosed embodiments. Those ordinarily skilled in the art will understand that various modifications and equivalent structures and functions may be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention as defined in the claims. Therefore, the invention as
25 defined in the claims must be accorded the broadest possible interpretation so as to encompass all such modifications and equivalent structures and functions.

30

What is claimed is:

1. A time simulation method of determining service availability of communications networks having a plurality of nodes and a plurality of links, comprising steps of:
 - (a) selecting a link between two network nodes;
 - (b) performing a simulated link failure on the selected link;
 - (c) selecting a connection between two network source and sink nodes;
 - (d) determining the unavailability and availability of the connection under the simulated link failure condition;
 - (e) repeating steps (c), and (a) and (b); and
 - (f) summing the unavailability and availability of connections after each repetition until a predetermined number of all (or a decided subset of) connections have been selected, and either until a simulated link failure has been performed on all links or until the summed unavailability and availability has been determined to converge, whichever is earlier.
2. The time simulation method according to claim 1, further comprising steps of:
 - averaging the service availability across all connections to generate the service availability of the network.
3. The time simulation method according to claim 1, wherein:
 - all the above steps are performed in response to clock increments, which proportionately correspond to actual times.
4. The time simulation method according to claim 1, wherein the network has corresponding nodes and links, the links having attributes in relation to their characteristics with respect to simulated failures, recovery and repair processes, the method further comprising a step of:
 - randomly selecting a link based on the attributes of the links.

5. The time simulation method according to claim 4, wherein the attributes are in relation to their distance, time-to-failure parameter (hereinafter called TTF), and time-to-recover/repair (hereinafter called TTR).

6. A time simulation apparatus for determining service availability of mesh or other communication networks, comprising:

a network having a plurality of nodes and a plurality of links; the links having attributes relating to their characteristics with respect to simulated failure, recovery and repair mechanisms;

a mechanism for selecting connections between source and sink nodes;

a failure/recovery module for performing a simulated failure and recovery of the selected link; a mechanism for selecting a connector between source and sink nodes; and

an arithmetic mechanism for calculating availability of the selected connection.

7. The time simulation apparatus according to claim 6, further comprising:

an averaging module for averaging the availability of connection for all possible connections in the network to generate the service availability of the network.

8. The time simulation apparatus according to claim 6, further comprising a clock for generating clock increments calibrated to correspond to a specific realtime interval.

9. The time simulation apparatus according to claim 6, wherein the network has corresponding nodes and links, the links have attributes in relation to their characteristics with respect to simulated failures, recovery and repair processes.

10. The time simulation apparatus according to claim 9, the apparatus further comprising a mechanism for randomly selecting a link based on the attributes of the links.

11. The time simulation apparatus according to claim 10, wherein the attributes are in relation to their distance.

5


Abstract of the Disclosure

5

A time simulation technique for determining the service availability (or unavailability) of end-to-end network connections (or paths) between source and sink nodes is disclosed. The method includes steps of: (a) selecting a link between two network nodes; (b) performing a simulated link failure on the selected link;

10 (c) selecting a connection between two network source and sink nodes; and (d) determining the unavailability and availability of the connection under the simulated link failure condition. The method further includes (e) of repeating (c) and (a) and (b); and (f) of summing the unavailability and availability of connections after each repetition until a predetermined number of connections

15 have been selected, and until a simulated link failure has been performed on all links; or until the summed unavailability and availability has been determined to converge, whichever is earlier.



13-11-00 14:56 FROM-GOWLING +613-563-0869 T-583 P. 6/28 F-577




Fig 3




Fig 4

Link Selection Probability Density




Fig 5

Link Selection Probability Distribution






Fig 6






Fig 9





Fig 11






Fig 12

Network Attributes - total:

- nodes (N)
- links (L)
- connections (C)
- link distance (TD)

Per Node Attributes:

(when included in availability simulation)



- no. connecting links
- which connecting links (i)
- selection criteria for failure
- failure data (FTTs, MTTF, TTF selection criteria & distribution)
- recovery data, if applicable (mechanism, TTRc)
- repair data (MTTRp, TTRp selection criteria & distribution)

Per Link Attributes:

- which connecting nodes
- distance (di)
- selection criteria for failure
- failure data (F, MTTF, TTF selection criteria & distribution)
- recovery data, if applicable (mechanism, TTRc)
- repair data (MTTRp, TTRp selection criteria & distribution)

Per Connection Attributes:

- which source (A) & sink (Z) nodes
- no intermediate nodes
- which intermediate nodes
- which links in connection (j)
- total distance (CD)
- recovery data, if applicable (mechanism, TTRc)



PATENT

COMBINED DECLARATION AND POWER OF ATTORNEY

ORIGINAL, DESIGN, NATIONAL STAGE OF PCT, SUPPLEMENTAL

As a below named inventor, I hereby declare that:

TYPE OF DECLARATION

This declaration is of the following type: Original

INVENTORSHIP IDENTIFICATION

My residence, post office address and citizenship are as stated below next to my name. I believe I am the original, first and sole inventor (if only one name is listed below) or an original, first and joint inventor (if plural names are listed below) of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought on the invention entitled:

TIME SIMULATION TECHNIQUES TO DETERMINE NETWORK AVAILABILITY

SPECIFICATION IDENTIFICATION

the specification of which:

☒ is attached hereto.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REVIEW OF PAPERS AND DUTY OF CANDOR

I hereby state that I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above identified specification, including the claims, as amended by any amendment referred to above.

I acknowledge the duty to disclose information which is material to the examination of this application in accordance with Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56(a).

PRIORITY CLAIM

I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under Title 35, United States Code, § 119 of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate or of any PCT international application(s) designating at least one country other than the United States of America listed below and have also identified below any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor's certificate or any PCT international application(s) designating at least one country other than the United States of America filed by me on the same subject matter having a filing date before that of the

Page 1 of 3

application(s) of which priority is claimed.

EARLIEST FOREIGN APPLICATION(S), IF ANY, FILED WITHIN 12 MONTHS
(6 MONTHS FOR DESIGN) PRIOR TO THIS U.S. APPLICATION

Country	Application No.	Date of Filing dd/mm/yyyy	Priority Claimed Under 37 USC 119
---------	-----------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------

ALL FOREIGN APPLICATION(S), IF ANY, FILED MORE THAN 12 MONTHS
(6 MONTHS FOR DESIGN) PRIOR TO THIS U.S. APPLICATION

Country	Application No.	Date of Filing
---------	-----------------	----------------

I hereby claim the benefit under Title 35, United States Code, § 120 of any United States application(s) listed below and, insofar as the subject matter of each of the claims of this application is not disclosed in the prior United States application in the manner provided by the first paragraph of Title 35, United States Code, § 112, I acknowledge the duty to disclose material information as defined in Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, § 1.56(a) which occurred between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT international filing date of this application:

[illegible]

POWER OF ATTORNEY

As a named inventor, I hereby appoint the following attorney(s) and/or agent(s) to prosecute this application and transact all business in the Patent and Trademark Office connected therewith. (List name(s) and registration number(s))

Bruce Dudley, Registration No. 24,634	Ed Rymek, Registration No. 26,644
Ivan Straznicky, Registration No. 20,119	Yoshiharu Toyooka, Registration No. 31,721
John W. Ross, Registration No. 26,436	Ikuko Wada, Registration No. 43,432
Judy A. Erratt, Registration No. 34,078	John D. Harris, Registration No. 39,485
Bruce E. Morgan, Registration No. 31,911	T. Gary O'Neill, Registration No. 36,355
Ell J. McKhool, Registration No. 20,778	
Anthony G. Creber, Registration No. 33,571	
Konrad Sochley, Registration No. 40,454	
Helene D'lorio, Registration No. 39,074	

- Attached as part of this declaration and power of attorney is the authorization of the above-named attorney(s) to accept and follow instructions from my representative(s).

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1P 1C3

Telephone: (613) 233-1781
Facsimile: (613) 563-9869

DIRECT TELEPHONE CALLS TO:

(Name and telephone number)

John D. Harris
(613) 786-8671

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that wilful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code, and that such wilful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

SIGNATURE (s)

Full name of first inventor:	GRUBER, John G.
Country of Citizenship:	Canada
Residence Address:	Orleans, Ontario, Canada
Post Office Address:	6355 Mattice Avenue, Orleans, Ontario, Canada, K1C 2G1

Date:

Signature: